

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Applicant thanks Examiner for a thorough examination.

The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-2, 4-16, 18-20, 21-26, 28-29, 31-32 and 34-36 are currently pending
- Claims 1, 11-16, 18, 19, 21, 31 and 35-36 are amended herein
- Claims 3, 17, 20, 27, 30, 33 and 37 are canceled herein

CITED DOCUMENTS

The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Abjanic:** Abjanic, U.S. Patent No. 6,732,175
- **Bau:** Bau et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,356,803

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER §101

Claims 11-20, 30-34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-patentable subject matter. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection and in the interests of expediting allowance of the application, Applicant has amended the claims.

With respect to claims 11 and 35, the Office rejects the claims as allegedly being directed to non-patentable subject matter. (Office Action, page 3) Independent claims 11 and 35 are amended to recite “[a] computer readable storage media...” Claims 12, 14-16 and 18-19 depend from claim 11 and are amended in a similar manner. Likewise, claim 36 depends from claim 35 and is amended in a similar manner. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the claim rejections under §101.

With respect to claims 31-34, the Office rejects the claims as being directed to non-patentable subject matter. (Office Action, pages 3-4) For the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office’s rejections, Applicant’s attorney has revised independent claim 31. Claims 32-34 depend from claim 31. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the claim rejections under §101.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER §112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 1, 11, 21 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office suggested clarifying the scope of “message recipient.” (Office Action, page 5) For the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office’s rejections, Applicant’s attorney has revised independent

claims 1, 11, 21 and 31. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 3-11, 13-21, 23-31 and 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(e) as being anticipated by Abjanic.

Claims 2, 6, 10, 12, 16, 20, 22, 26, 30, 32 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Abjanic in view of Bau.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the rejections, Applicant herein amends the independent claims, as shown above and discussed below. Independent claim 1 incorporates subject matter from now-canceled dependent claim 3.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method for open content model Web service messaging in a networked computing environment, the method comprising (Underlined text indicates amended language):

- generating a transport neutral message comprising message recipient information, endpoint addressing information, and one or more reference properties comprising selectively opaque message context, a portion of the selectively opaque context directs a message recipient as to how to handle one or more messages sent to the endpoint in a session;
- binding the transport neutral message to a transport protocol for communication to the message recipient; and

- wherein at least a portion of the selectively opaque message context is not directed to the message recipient.

Abjanic is directed to “a network apparatus [that] is provided between a network and a plurality of processing nodes or servers. The network apparatus includes a content based message director (e.g., XML director) to route or direct messages received from the network to one of the processing nodes based upon the application data.” (Abjanic, Abstract) Abjanic states that “the traffic manager 140 and the director 145 are located in front of the one or more application servers or processing nodes.” (Abjanic, Col. 5, lines 15-17) Abjanic further states “the director 145 (FIG. 1) parses all or part of the application data (the XML data in this example) and can check to ensure that the XML document or application is well formed (i.e. checks to make sure at least a portion of the XML document meets the so-called well formedness constraints or requirements in the XML specification or standard). (Abjanic, Col. 6, lines 39-45) Abjanic still further states “if there is a match between the content of the application data (e.g., the business transaction information which may be provided as XML data) of a message and a configuration pattern or query, then the director 145 directs or switches the message to the corresponding server.” (Abjanic, Col. 6, lines 63-67) Abjanic requires the director to parse the data, analyze the data and make the pertinent decisions based on the parsing and analyzing. Further, Abjanic requires a director component to accomplish these tasks and requires that the director be located in front of the application servers or nodes. Abjanic does not disclose

that “a portion of the selectively opaque context directs a message recipient as to how to handle one or more messages sent to the endpoint in a session,” as recited in amended independent claim 1. Instead of a director directing the message as stated in Abjanic, the opaque context portion of the message directs the message itself from the beginning to the end in amended independent claim 1. Further, while the message recipient is not a director, it is located at an endpoint of the message and not in front of the application servers or processing nodes as described in Abjanic.

In rejecting now-canceled dependent claim 3, the Office points to Abjanic and states that Abjanic discloses that the XML information provided within the message is used by the director to make routing decisions. (Office Action, page 7)

The cited passages are reproduced below:

```
<XML>
<From>intel.com</From>
<To>bookstore.com</To>
<PurchaseBook>
  <ISBN>02013798233</ISBN>
  <Purchase Amount >98</PurchaseAmount>
</PurchaseBook>
</XML>
(Abjanic, Col. 5, lines 60-67)
```

and

In this example message, the business transaction information provided within the application data as XML data relates to the transaction or describes the transaction, including, for example, what kind of business transaction (a purchase order or to purchase a book), who it is from and who it is to, an ISBN number to identify the goods to be purchased and the amount of the purchase (PurchaseAmount). These are merely examples of the types of

business transaction information in a message upon which the director 145 can analyze and make routing or switching decisions for the message. (Abjanic, Col. 6, lines 28-38)

The cited passage does not disclose “a portion of the selectively opaque context directs a message recipient as to how to handle one or more messages sent to the endpoint in a session,” as recited in amended independent claim 1. As discussed above, the director is required to analyze and make routing decisions for the message in Abjanic. However, the amended language in claim 1 makes it clear that a portion of the message directs the message recipient what to do with the message and no parsing or analyzing is necessary. Furthermore, a separate director component is not necessary. Instead the message recipient, no matter who it is, handles the message at the direction of the opaque context.

Consequently, Abjanic does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 2, 4-5 and 8-9 depend from claim 1 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 1 apply equally to these claims. Claims 2 and 6 also stand rejected under an additional reference, Bau. Bau is specifically cited for its disclosure of “message source” in dependent claim 2 and SOAP in claim 6. (Office Action, page 10) However, Bau fails to remedy the deficiencies of Abjanic discussed above with respect to claim 1. Specifically, the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest “a portion of the selectively opaque

context directs a message recipient as to how to handle one or more messages sent to the endpoint in a session,” as recited in amended independent claim 1. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

Independent claim 11, as amended, recites a computer-readable storage medium comprising computer-program instructions for open content model Web service messaging in a networked computing environment, the computer-program instructions being executable by a processor for (Amended text is underlined):

- generating a transport neutral message comprising message recipient information, endpoint addressing information, and one or more reference properties comprising selectively opaque message context, the addressing information and selectively opaque message context are respectfully specified by an endpoint reference and message information headers, the message information headers further comprising a reply to property identifying an intended recipient for a reply to the transport neutral message and a relates to property that indicates how the transport neutral message relates to a different transport neutral message;
- binding the transport neutral message to a transport protocol for communication to the message recipient; and
- wherein at least a portion of the selectively opaque message context is not directed to the message recipient.

As discussed above, Abjanic is directed to “a network apparatus [that] is provided between a network and a plurality of processing nodes or servers.” (Abjanic, Abstract) Abjanic states “the business transaction information provided within the application data as XML data relates to the transaction or describes the transaction, including, for example, what kind of business transaction (a purchase

order or to purchase a book), who it is from and who it is to, an ISBN number to identify the goods to be purchased and the amount of the purchase (PurchaseAmount).” (Abjanic, Col. 6, lines 28-36) Abjanic does not disclose:

the addressing information and selectively opaque message context are respectfully specified by an endpoint reference and message information headers, the message information headers further comprising a reply to property identifying an intended recipient for a reply to the transport neutral message and a relates to property that indicates how the transport neutral message relates to a different transport neutral message,
as recited in amended claim 11.

Abjanic simply includes information relating to a particular purchase order in the XML information. For instance, who the order is from and who it is to, identification number and amount. Abjanic does not disclose reply to information and a relates to property signaling how it relates to other messages.

Now-canceled dependent claim 10 is incorporated into independent claim 11. Dependent claim 10 is rejected as being obvious over Abjanic in view of Bau. In rejecting now-canceled dependent claim 10, the Office states that Abjanic does not explicitly disclose that the message information headers further comprise a reply to property identifying an intended recipient for a reply to the transport neutral message. Applicant agrees. However, the Office states that Bau discloses an XML based message protocol similar to Abjanic’s where the message includes the identifier of a client sending the message that globally identifies the client such that the server can route the callback to the appropriate client. The

Office points to Fig. 4 in Bau. (Office Action, page 11) For convenience and clarification, Fig. 4 is reproduced below:

```
<s:Envelope xmlns:s="http://schemas.xmlsoap.org/soap/envelope/"
  xmlns:c="http://openuri.org/soap/conversations">
  <s:Header>
    <c:conversationID>42332-133314-3225132:42332-3144-2332231</c:conversationID>
    <c:defaultCallbackURL>
      http://original.com/foo/Callbacks.jwl
    </c:defaultCallbackURL>
  </s:Header>
  <s:body>
    <!-- contents omitted -->
  </s:body>
</s:Envelope>
```

FIG. 4

However, Bau does not teach or suggest “the message information headers further comprising a reply to property identifying an intended recipient for a reply to the transport neutral message and a relates to property that indicates how the transport neutral message relates to a different transport neutral message,” as recited in independent claim 11. Bau does not teach a reply to property and a relates to property. In fact, nowhere in either Abjanic or Bau is a relates to property that indicates how the message relates to other messages disclose, taught or suggested.

Consequently, Abjanic and Bau do not disclose, teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim, whether taken alone or in combination. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 12-16 and 18-19 depend from claim 11 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 11 apply equally to these claims.

Claims 12 and 16 also stand rejected under an additional reference, Bau. Bau is specifically cited for its disclosure of “message source” in dependent claim 12 and SOAP in claim 16. (Office Action, page 10) However, Bau fails to remedy the deficiencies of Abjanic discussed above with respect to claim 11. Specifically, the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest “the message information headers further comprising a reply to property identifying an intended recipient for a reply to the transport neutral message and a relates to property that indicates how the transport neutral message relates to a different transport neutral message,” as recited in independent claim 11. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

Independent claim 21 stands rejected as allegedly being anticipated over Abjanic. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office’s rejection, Applicant has amended this claim in a manner similar to independent claims 1 and 11 discussed above. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 11, Abjanic does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 22, 24-26 and 28-29 depend from claim 21 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 21 apply equally to these claims. Claims 22 and 26 also stand rejected under an additional reference, Bau. Bau is

specifically cited for its disclosure of “message source” in dependent claim 22 and SOAP in claim 26. (Office Action, page 10) However, Bau fails to remedy the deficiencies of Abjanic discussed above with respect to claim 21. Specifically, the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest “a portion of the selectively opaque context directs a message recipient as to how to handle one or more messages sent to the endpoint in a session” and “the message information headers further comprising a reply to property identifying an intended recipient for a reply to the transport neutral message and a relates to property that indicates how the transport neutral message relates to a different transport neutral message,” as recited in independent claim 21. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

Independent claim 31 stands rejected as allegedly being anticipated over Abjanic. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office’s rejection, Applicant has amended this claim in a manner similar to independent claim 1 discussed above. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Abjanic does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent claims 32 and 34 depend from claim 31 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 31 apply equally to these claims. Claim

32 also stands rejected under an additional reference, Bau. Bau is specifically cited for its disclosure of “message source” in dependent claim 32. (Office Action, page 10) However, Bau fails to remedy the deficiencies of Abjanic discussed above with respect to claim 31. Specifically, the cited references do not disclose, teach or suggest “a portion of the selectively opaque context directs a message recipient as to how to handle one or more messages sent to the endpoint in a session,” as recited in independent claim 31. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

Independent claim 35 stands rejected as allegedly being anticipated over Abjanic. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, for the sole purpose of expediting allowance and without conceding the propriety of the Office’s rejection, Applicant has amended this claim in a manner similar to independent claim 1 discussed above. For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Abjanic does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent claim 36 depends from claim 35 and, as such, the remarks made above in regards to claim 35 apply equally to this claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features, which the references of record have not been shown to disclose, teach or suggest.

CONCLUSION

All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability, **Applicant respectfully requests a call to discuss any remaining issues.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: May 4, 2010

By: /Dale G. Mohlenhoff 37,683/
Dale G. Mohlenhoff
Reg. No. 37,683
(509) 944-4738

Colin D. Barnitz
Reg. No. 35061